

# Universal Basic Income

Ursula Huws is correct to say that the only way a Universal Basic Income can be redistributive is if it is paid for by taxes on employers and on the rich (Letters, 15 August). In fact taxes on the rich would be enough. When UBI is eventually introduced, it will probably be set at a relatively low level, then subsequently raised. Different states will introduce it in different ways. The countries of the Eurozone could consider introducing a common basic income as part of the harmonisation of taxation and benefits. As when unemployment benefit was introduced, there will be derision and claims that UBI is far too expensive, or that it is a sop to employers.

On 8 August it was revealed that the number of people in Britain claiming non-domicile tax status had fallen to a record low, partly because some of the super-rich left the UK in fear that the Labour Party might win an election and introduce a wealth tax. If you think that isn't possible, ask yourself why so many of the super-rich don't agree with you. Fortunately, the amount of wealth remaining in the UK is enormous. A modest UBI is affordable. More of the super-rich would leave if it were introduced; but they can't take their land with them. The nicer ones would stay, and they would receive UBI too.

**Danny Dorling**

St Peter's College, Oxford

---

Reference to the fact stated (if needed):

[https://www.theguardian.com/business/2019/aug/08/britons-non-domicile-status-drops-record-low-brexit-wealth-tax?CMP=Share\\_iOSApp\\_Other](https://www.theguardian.com/business/2019/aug/08/britons-non-domicile-status-drops-record-low-brexit-wealth-tax?CMP=Share_iOSApp_Other)